

AN ANALYSIS OF NCAA MEMBER ATHLETICS PROGRAMS THAT ADDED OR DISCONTINUED FOOTBALL PROGRAMS BETWEEN 1996 AND 2005

Aaron D. Dunham

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science (Sport Administration)

Chapel Hill
2007

Approved by:

Dr. Nathan Tomasini

Dr. Ed Shields, Jr.

Ms. Martina Ballen, MBA

ABSTRACT

Aaron D. Dunham: An Analysis of NCAA Member Athletic Programs that Added or Discontinued Football Programs from 1996 to 2005
(Under the direction of Dr. Nathan Tomasini)

The purpose of this study was to determine the primary reasons why colleges and universities added or dropped football programs during the ten-year period of 1996 to 2005. A secondary purpose was to analyze the opinions and outcomes of these institutions' respective decisions. The results of this study were obtained through an online survey of athletics administrators at those institutions that added or dropped football during the relevant time period. Specifically, the results showed more athletics administrators cited the desire to increase enrollment as a factor behind the decision than any other single factor. For those schools that dropped football between 1996 and 2005, the desire to reduce total athletic department expenses was viewed by more athletics administrators as an important factor behind their decisions than any other single factor. This study serves as an aid to those athletic departments currently contemplating whether to add or drop football, and given the lack of empirical research on this topic, will hopefully serve to facilitate future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of Study	3
	Research Questions	3
	Assumptions	4
	Delimitations	4
	Limitations	5
	Significance of the Study	5
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
	History of College Football Pre-1984	8
	Important Changes in College Football since 1984	8
	Current Financials of College Football	10
	Literature and Research on the Effects of College Football	11
	Motivations of Universities to Add or Drop Football Programs	13
III.	METHODOLOGY	17
	Subjects	17
	Instrumentation/Procedures	18
	Data Analysis	19
IV.	RESULTS	20
V.	DISCUSSION	38

APPENDICES	41
Appendix A: Survey of Schools that Added Football from 1996-2005.....	41
Appendix B: Survey of Schools that Dropped Football from 1996-2005.....	46
REFERENCES	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Number of Respondents by Institution - NCAA Member Athletics Programs that Added Football from 1996 to 2005.....	20
2. In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing athletic department revenue on the decision to add football?.....	21
3. In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing the prestige of the institution on the decision to add football?.....	22
4. In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing enrollment on the decision to add football?.....	23
5. Responses to Enrollment Question Broken Down by NCAA Classification.....	23
6. In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing freshman applications on the decision to add football?.....	24
7. In your opinion, how much of factor was increasing the athletic donor base on the decision to add football?.....	25
8. In your opinion, how much of a factor was establishing or maintaining conference affiliation on the decision to add football?.....	25
9. In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing student-athlete opportunities on the decision to the add football?.....	26
10. The current director of athletics is satisfied with the decision to add football.....	27
11. The current athletic department senior staff is satisfied with the decision to add football.....	27
12. The prestige of the university has increased since the institution added football.....	28
13. Enrollment has increased since the institution added football.....	28
14. Freshman applications have increased since the institution added football.....	28
15. Student-athlete opportunities have increased since the institution added football.....	28
16. Alumni donations to <u>athletics</u> have increased since the institution added football....	29

17. Athletics department revenues exceeded expenses in the first year after the institution added football.....	29
18. FOOTBALL revenues have exceeded expenses in <u>at least</u> one year since the institution added football.....	29
19. Number of Respondents by Institution – NCAA Member Athletics Programs that Dropped Football from 1996 to 2005.....	31
20. In your opinion, how much of a factor was reducing total athletic department expenses on the decision to drop football?.....	32
21. In your opinion, how much of a factor was Title IX on the decision to drop football?.....	32
22. In your opinion, how much of a factor was the lack of a winning program on the decision to drop football?.....	33
23. In your opinion, how much of a factor was football game attendance on the decision to drop football?.....	33
24. In your opinion, how much of a factor was the desire to establish or maintain conference affiliation on the decision to drop football?.....	34
25. The current director of athletics is satisfied with the decision to drop football.....	35
26. The current athletic department senior staff is satisfied with the decision to drop football.....	35
27. The current board of trustees is satisfied with the decision to drop football.....	35
28. The athletic department has operated with a balanced budget since the institution dropped football.....	36
29. The athletic department has been in compliance with Title IX since the decision to drop football.....	36
30. Student enrollment numbers have decreased since the institution dropped football.....	37
31. The number of freshman applications to the institution has decreased since the institution dropped football.....	37
32. Alumni donations to <u>athletics</u> have decreased since the institution dropped football.....	37

Chapter I

Introduction

One of the biggest fiscal decisions confronting athletics administrators in a budget quandary is whether to add or drop football. It is the driving financial force behind athletics departments that offer the sport, but it also accounts for the largest percentage of the athletics budget. Many schools are looking to add the sport because intercollegiate football is highly visible and has the potential to generate both significant media attention and revenue for a school (Toma, 2003). At these institutions, administrators envision dollar signs, stadiums full of screaming students on fall Saturdays, ESPN anchors shouting out their school names on SportsCenter, soaring application and enrollment rates, enormous donations from avid boosters, and increases in corporate sponsorships and merchandise sales. However, other schools mired in the reality of continuous budget deficits are examining dropping football due to the high costs. The athletics director at University of North Carolina-Charlotte, a school with an \$8.5 million athletics budget for 2005-06 and little interest in starting a football program, recently estimated that football would cost her school “\$10 million per year” (Scott & Olson, 2005, p.3). Thus, the decision by a particular school to add or drop a football program may be important, with many positive and negative ramifications.

From 1996 to 2005, 33 NCAA member schools added football, while 17 discontinued the sport, and there is no indication these numbers will decrease anytime soon (NCAA, 2005). In North Carolina, three schools (Brevard College, Campbell University and University of North Carolina-Pembroke) are set to add football programs by the 2008 season, and Old Dominion

University in Virginia will field a football team beginning in 2009 (Let Them Play Foundation, 2005). Leaders at the smaller North Carolina schools all cite similar reasons for the addition of football, namely greater prestige for the school and increased enrollment. And the addition of football will only seem natural at Old Dominion, which is among the best teams in their conference in many other sports. Furthermore, it will allow Old Dominion “to expand several established rivalries” within their I-AA conference (“Game on”, 2006, para. 4).

Meanwhile, Allen University in South Carolina recently eliminated its football program because it could not “afford the \$1.4 million annual price tag” and “brought in less than \$30,000 in 2005 while playing six home games in two rented high school stadiums” (Associated Press, 2006a, p.1). Recent trends have demonstrated the addition of football to be most popular among the small college ranks, while the majority of schools that have dropped have been scholarship-based teams from Division I-A and I-AA unable to keep pace with rising operating expenditures and tuition costs (Pennington, 2006a).

There are an abundance of potential reasons for adding a college football program. Athletics administrators eye the revenue-generation potential of football; in particular, the impact football can have on revenue streams such as corporate sponsorships, merchandise and ticket sales. They hope for increases in athletics donations, although recent research has found “no relationship of any kind between won-lost records in football and general giving rates” at higher-profile and Ivy League schools (Turner, Meserve & Bowen, 2001, p.6). They also believe football can help increase the prestige of their school; after all, “colleges and universities at all levels attempt to make a name for themselves through sports” (Suggs, n.d., p.61). In addition, due to the lower number of male college students throughout the country, football may be viewed by administrators as a means to boost male student recruitment. Increases could be

realized in both male applications and enrollees as “college officials who have added football say it is easier to recruit males who many not play the sport but who want to attend a college with a football team to watch” (Suggs, n.d., p.62).

There may also be a multitude of reasons why institutions decide to drop college football from their athletics programs. Many schools have decided they do not want to bear the costs of fielding a football program, especially at the expense of the university general fund. There are arguments as to whether a financial arms race exists in intercollegiate athletics, but there is no denying total operating expenses are increasing annually (Fulks, 2004). East Tennessee State University eliminated their football program in 2003 after discovering “scholarships, team travel and coaches’ salaries – to mention only three components-don’t come cheap” (Harris, 2006, p.1). Other schools such as St. John’s University of New York eliminated football because they stated they could not comply with Title IX, a federal gender-equity law (Suggs, 2003a). At St. John’s, the large football roster size created a “male-female imbalance” which did not satisfy the strictest benchmark required by the law (Pennington, 2006a, p.6). Less common reasons for dropping football from an athletics program may be the inability to sustain a winning program or meet Division I-A attendance requirements.

There are two main purposes of this study. The first purpose is to determine the primary reasons why colleges and universities added or dropped football programs during the ten-year period of 1996 to 2005. A secondary purpose is to analyze the opinions and outcomes of these institutions’ respective decisions. For those NCAA member schools that added a football program from 1996 to 2005, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Did schools add football in order to increase athletic department revenue?
2. Did schools add football in order to increase prestige?

3. Did schools add football in order to increase enrollment?
4. Did schools add football in order to increase freshman applications?
5. Did schools add football in order to increase the athletic donor base?
6. Did schools add football in order to establish or maintain conference affiliation?
7. Did schools add football because of any additional factors?
8. What are the opinions and outcomes of the decision to add football?

For those NCAA member schools that dropped a football program between 1996 and 2005, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Did schools drop football in order to reduce total athletic department expenses?
2. Did schools drop football because of Title IX?
3. Did schools drop football because of a lack of a winning program?
4. Did schools drop football because of football game attendance?
5. Did schools drop football in order to establish or maintain conference affiliation?
6. Did schools drop football because of any additional factors?
7. What are the opinions and outcomes of the decision to drop football?

Assumptions

1. Respondents will answer all questions truthfully and to the best of their knowledge.
2. The returned surveys provided a large enough, and representative sample of NCAA member institutions that have added or dropped a football program between 1996 and 2005.

Delimitations

1. This study is delimited to athletic department administrators at each of the NCAA member institutions who have added or dropped football within the last ten years. It

- does not include the chancellor or president, members of the board of trustees, or any other high-ranking officials at these institutions. However, it is believed those officials would have been heavily involved in the decision-making process.
2. Only those schools with current NCAA membership were included in the sample, since it is the sole officially-recognized governing body for institutions that compete in intercollegiate athletics.
 3. The time period of this study was delimited to the ten-year period of 1996 to 2005 since it would likely prove difficult to collect data from previous years. Even within the last decade, many athletic administrators have presumably either left their school for another job or retired since the decision was handed down. Yet since the study only focuses on the last ten years, it was believed most of the athletic administrators involved in the decision to add or drop football could be identified for the study

Limitations

1. The sample size of this study is somewhat small (limited to just over fifty institutions), necessitating caution in extrapolation of the data to a larger population.
2. Respondents may be hesitant to provide truthful answers for fear of upsetting their counterparts on the senior staff or in the general administration of the institution, and may furthermore regard some information as confidential.

Significance of Study

Athletics administrators who are debating whether to add or drop football may use the findings from this study as an aid in their decision-making process. If a high percentage of administrators confirm the addition of football has increased applications, enrollment and prestige at their school, institutions pondering the addition of football may use the statistical

support to help influence the process at their own schools. Similarly, if a high percentage of administrators reveal they are dissatisfied with the decision to drop football at their school, other institutions may be dissuaded from making the decision. Also, given the lack of empirical research on this topic, this study will hopefully serve to facilitate future research.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

This review of literature will help establish the framework for a survey of institutions that added or discontinued NCAA intercollegiate football programs between 1996 and 2005. The first section will examine the history of college football until the landmark Supreme Court decision in 1984 that allowed individual schools to negotiate their own television broadcast contracts. The second segment will outline important changes in college football from the 1984 case until 2005. The third section will discuss the current financial state of NCAA intercollegiate football. The fourth section will examine literature and research on the effects of college sports on the variables of alumni donations, applications and prestige. The final section will detail specific literature on reasons schools have added or dropped football programs.

History of College Football Pre-1984

The first collegiate football game was played between Princeton and Rutgers on November 6, 1869 (Perrin, 1987). The eight schools that comprise the Ivy League today (Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton and Yale) were among the first to introduce football on their campuses. Yet over time, those same schools gradually de-emphasized the sport since they did not offer athletics scholarships. The 1920's were known as the "golden decade" in collegiate football as larger state schools enjoyed their first undefeated seasons (Perrin, 1987). These schools included the University of Alabama (Alabama), University of Notre Dame (Notre Dame), Purdue University (Purdue) and the University of Southern California (USC). College football continued to grow in the 1960's, as

those larger state schools experienced continued success, and other programs that are still powerhouses today began to rise to national prominence. These schools included the University of Michigan (Michigan) The Ohio State University (Ohio State), Penn State University (Penn State) and the University of Texas (Texas). As the gap widened between the haves and have-nots, the NCAA chose to create three separate divisions in 1973, each with its own legislation (History of the NCAA, 2006). Division I schools were the football-playing institutions with larger budgets, better facilities and more scholarships. And just five years later, the NCAA further separated Division I into I-A, I-AA and I-AAA, with just the I-A and I-AA subdivisions sponsoring football (History of the NCAA, 2006). The traditional powerhouse programs have resided in Division I-A ever since.

Important Changes in College Football since 1984

The relationship between the NCAA and college football was largely affected by an important case decided by the Supreme Court in 1984. Prior to that decision, the NCAA exercised control over all college football telecasts (Bennett and Fazel, 1995). The University of Georgia and the University of Oklahoma wanted freedom to negotiate their own deals, and made an antitrust challenge to the NCAA television plan of only broadcasting one game per week for the 1981 - 85 college football seasons. In *National Collegiate Athletic Association v. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma*, the Court sided with the Universities of Georgia and Oklahoma, ruling the television plan constituted “a restraint upon the operation of a free market” (NCAA, 1984). The result of the decision was schools could now “pursue their own broadcast contracts, enabling them to make millions of dollars” (Suggs, 2004, p.1). The financial picture of college football had forever been altered. Lower-tier schools in Division I-A, or even I-AA, now had unprecedented access to television exposure and the resulting dollars.

Another important development in the college football landscape was the creation of the Bowl Championship Series (BCS) in 1998. The BCS was created “to determine the national champion for college football while maintaining and enhancing the bowl system” (BCS Background, 2006, paragraph 2). The goal was to pair the top two teams in the country in a national championship game, whereas the previous bowl structures had been flawed in this regard. Recent BCS bowl games brought both dollars and television exposure to the competing schools. In 2006, the eight BCS participants each earned an average of \$15.7 million for their respective conferences (Wieberg, 2005). The four BCS bowl games also drew an average television rating of close to 14.0, meaning they were seen in almost 14% of United States households (BCS TV Ratings, 2007).

The major flaw with the Bowl Championship Series (BCS) was that the number of competing schools with access to the financial windfall and television exposure was initially limited to those schools in the major conferences. In 2003, Tulane University president Scott Cowen testified before the United States Senate Judiciary Committee on behalf of the Presidential Coalition for Athletics Reform. He argued that the system was unfair, inconsistent, harmful, and offered less restrictive solutions, and advocated for “a system that is inclusive...and is reasonably consistent with how national championships are conducted in all other NCAA-sponsored sports” (Cowen, 2003, p.4). And in 2006, the BCS responded by implementing changes both in the number of games sponsored as well as the criterion, which opened up access to even more Division I-A institutions (BCS FAQ, 2007). The inclusion of, and subsequent victory by, Boise State in the 2007 Fiesta Bowl was further proof of the new opportunities available to smaller institutions under the BCS system.

Current Financials of College Football

Revenue generation for an athletics department may be an important factor in the decision to add football. As expected, schools with football programs have reported greater athletic department revenues than those without football. Division I-A programs reported average total revenues of \$29.4 million in 2003, and of that total, football programs accounted for roughly 45 percent of the total revenues (Fulks, 2005a). In comparison, average total revenues were just \$7.2 million for Division I-AA schools with football and \$6.2 million for Division I-AAA schools without football (Fulks, 2005a). More importantly, the average Division I-A program reported football-related revenues of \$11.5 million and expenses of \$6.5 million in 2002 (Fulks, 2003). Football not only brought in money at the average Division I-A school, but it also brought in more revenues than expenditures. The top Division I-A conferences made even more money, due in large part to the hefty payouts tied to NCAA-sanctioned bowl games (Toma, 2003). The Southeastern Conference (SEC) reported whopping revenues of \$26.9 million in 2002 (Fulks, 2003). The financial numbers were a lot smaller at the lower NCAA classifications. Reported revenues were just \$2.6 million for Division II programs with football and \$1.7 million for Division II programs without football (Fulks, 2005a).

Athletic programs that sponsor football may have greater revenues, but they also incur more expenses than their non-football playing counterparts. This could be an important factor in the decision to drop football, particularly if revenues are not exceeding projections. Sperber (2000) acknowledged this alarming fact that “*most college sports programs lose money*” (p. 219). Division I-A programs reported average total expenses of \$27.2 million in 2003, \$6.6 million of which was earmarked exclusively for football (Suggs, 2004). In comparison, average total athletic department expenses were \$7.5 million in Division I-AA and \$6.5 million in

Division I-AAA (Fulks, 2005a). At the Division II level, those programs with football spent \$2.7 million and those without spent \$1.9 million (Fulks, 2005a). Similarly, Division III programs with football spent nearly \$700,000 more than those without during the 2003 fiscal year (Fulks, 2005b). These numbers, when compared to the total revenues, seem to indicate “for all schools outside (and most in) Division I, intercollegiate athletics is a financial drain” (Noll, 1999, p.30).

Literature and Research on the Effects of College Football

Of all the NCAA member institutions that pondered adding or dropping a football program from 1996 to 2005, many faced concerns beyond just their own bottom lines. Some university officials simply wanted to increase the prestige of their school by adding football (Pennington, 2006a). For these administrators, the lure of college football may have been a tremendous media opportunity and a worthwhile investment. Commenting on the 2001 establishment of Florida Atlantic University’s football program, a student remarked: “It’s great seeing my school on *SportsCenter*, even if the FAU player is the one chasing the other guy running for a touchdown” (Elmore, 2006, p.5). As Toma (2003) observed, college football has the unique power to make “indistinguishable large institutions distinctive...and...otherwise distant institutions accessible” (p.1). In addition, college football “is what many outsiders know and like about an institution” as well as “the most distinctive and most noteworthy aspect of the majority of flagship universities” (Toma, 2003, pp.5-6). The prevailing idea among some administrators was consistent with the beliefs of Toma; that is, college football would bring increased visibility to their campuses, and bring more “alumni back to school to visit and watch games” (Coe, 2005, p.1). Football may indeed be perceived by these administrators as the front porch of the university, even though two-thirds of respondents to a 2003 survey conducted by the

Chronicle of Higher Education believed that four-year colleges and universities put too much emphasis on athletics (Suggs, 2003c).

Another potential factor in the decision to add football was the belief it would lead to tangible increases in application numbers. There are differing viewpoints as to the impact college sports, and in particular football, can have on such an indirect benefit. Noll (1999) hypothesized that “schools not well known outside their home region can benefit indirectly from a successful Division I team by increasing applications for admission” (p.30). This assertion is bolstered by the dramatic 30 percent increase in applications experienced by Boston College after their star quarterback Doug Flutie threw a miraculous last-second touchdown pass to beat Miami in 1984 (Burris, 2004). The so-called “Flutie Factor” was in effect at other schools as well. Toma and Cross (1998) measured application rates at schools that had won championships in football and men’s basketball between 1979 and 1992, and found a positive relationship between applications and success. However, in a 2005 follow-up study commissioned by the NCAA, Orszag and Orszag reaffirmed their findings from an initial 2003 report that increased football spending had a minimal effect on application percentages. Their conclusions do not devalue the impact of isolated scenarios such as the “Flutie Factor”. However, “if expanding its application pool is an institution’s goal, it faces many more attractive investment opportunities than those it confronts in the domain of big-time college athletics” (Frank, 2004, p.10).

An additional hope for institutions was their commitment to success on the football field would translate into increased alumni donations to the athletic program or the university as a whole. Turner, Meserve & Bowen (2001) studied 15 selective private schools to determine a relationship between football winning percentage and giving behavior. Their conclusions refuted “the notion that winning and giving go hand-in-hand at the selective private universities that play

big-time football” (p.1). The aforementioned follow-up study by Orszag and Orszag (2005) also contested “the hypothesis that increased operating expenditures on sports affect other measurable indications, including alumni giving” (p.8). However, their data examined a ten-year period so a relationship between football success and alumni giving may still exist over longer periods of time (Orszag & Orszag, 2005). Research was also hindered by the lack of reliable capital expenditure accounting in the NCAA/EADA data (Orszag & Orszag, 2005). The biggest hope for institutions with respect to increased alumni donations was seemingly through increased enrollment (Noll, 1999, p.30). That is, “if more and better students attend, the university might receive more alumni gifts a few decades later” (Noll, 1999, p.30).

Motivations of Universities to Add or Drop Football Programs

At several NCAA member institutions in Divisions I-AA, II and III, university administrators viewed football simply as a means to boost enrollment. Suggs (2003b) noted “as enrollments have skewed female, especially at colleges with a strong focus on the liberal arts, colleges have looked to football...as an important source for male students” (p.1). The large rosters of football teams usually allowed institutions to “bring 20 to 30 men per year into each entering class” (Suggs, 2003b, p.1). An increase in male students helped many schools caught in the gender gap achieve a more desirable student body. After Shenandoah University in Virginia added football in 2000, the school experienced a six percent increase in undergraduate male enrollment, bringing the total to 41 percent (Pennington, 2006a). Officials at colleges such as Shenandoah firmly believed “football can bring in more tuition-paying students than any other course or activity” (Pennington, 2006a, p.1). Even Shenandoah athletic director John Hill acknowledged there might not be five admissions officers who could guarantee you so many new male students in an entering class (Pennington, 2006a). The University of Mary Hardin-Baylor

in Texas experienced a similar increase in male enrollment, increasing from 32 to 40 percent, after football was added at the school (Pennington, 2006a). School president Dr. Jerry G. Bawcom acknowledged football had provided the school with name recognition in important metropolitan areas where they had previously struggled to attract applicants (Pennington, 2006a).

The increase in applicants at small colleges was not just limited to male football players. Many administrators at these schools “said football programs also attracted students interested in ancillary activities, like bands and cheerleading, or fields of study like athletic training and sports journalism” (Pennington, 2006a, p.3). An admissions officer at Brevard College in North Carolina, which added a program in 2006 and enrolls 584 students, confirmed the mere presence of football on their campus had attracted new applicants that yearned simply for “the tradition of football” (College will be glad it has football, 2006, p.1). The belief at Brevard was football would create a broader applicant pool as well as “a bigger, more diverse student population” (College will be glad it has football, 2006, p.1).

The aforementioned high cost of fielding a football program has led many colleges to drop the sport altogether. No matter how a school is classified within the NCAA, “football is a phenomenally expensive sport” (Suggs, 2003b, p.1). For example, if a school sponsored football at the highest level of competition (Division I-A), and also gave out the maximum number of scholarships allowed by the NCAA (85), that cost alone would have approached \$1 million plus tuition (Noll, 1999). The cost is even higher at private universities, so many Division I basketball schools do not even sponsor Division I-A football (Noll, 1999). Smaller institutions such as Canisius College and St. John’s University in New York, and Fairfield University in Connecticut, eliminated their programs in recent years solely because the rising costs had “outstripped the need for football players” (Suggs, 2003b, p.1).

Institutions also face federal gender equity regulations in their required adherence to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. This law banned sex discrimination at institutions that received federal funding (Title IX § 1681, 2000). When St. John's University of New York eliminated football after the 2002 season, its president cited Title IX as the most compelling reason behind the move (Suggs, 2003a). The strictest Title IX standard required colleges to have roughly the same proportion of female athletes as female undergraduates, and large football rosters made compliance with this benchmark very difficult for athletic departments. While some of the difficulty could be alleviated through better management of funds, some institutions were forced to add as many as three women's sports just to accommodate football and those additional operating costs generally made for a huge drain on the overall athletics budget (Associated Press, 2006b). Schools dropped football not only to comply with Title IX, but also "to make the remaining teams more competitive" (Suggs, 2003a, p.1). Meanwhile, other institutions such as James Madison University in Virginia were faced with a quandary about whether to keep football or eliminate other men's sports. Since a startling 61 percent of its student body was female, JMU officials eliminated 10 teams (seven of which were men's sports) in order to satisfy the proportionality benchmark (Pennington, 2006b). Outraged students on those teams did not implicitly blame football for their plight, but clearly "the presence of football...is usually a significant part of any debate after the elimination of men's sports" (Pennington, 2006b, p.2).

An additional motivation for schools to drop football would be the inability to sustain a competitive team. The lack of a successful program has an impact beyond just wins and losses. For instance, a frequent byproduct of a losing football program is poor attendance at home games. While poor attendance inevitably impacts the athletic department bottom line, it can be

even more problematic for schools at the Division I-A level. In order to maintain full membership at that level, a school must “average at least 15,000 in actual or paid attendance for all home football games...once every two years on a rolling basis” (NCAA, 2006, p.364). Twelve teams failed to meet the requirement during the 2005 season, and each of those schools could eventually be subjected to a “restricted” membership that would eliminate future bowl game opportunities (Carey & O’Toole, 2006). The inability to meet such requirements could be another reason why schools drop football from their athletic programs.

Two particular schools had an institution-specific reason for dropping football altogether. Swarthmore College, a Pennsylvania school with a sterling academic reputation, discontinued their program in 2000. Although they did not award athletic scholarships, Swarthmore only carried 375 admissions slots and “could only hold so many athletes before they start to overwhelm the campus.” Indeed, an elite school such as Swarthmore had to “reach a little deeper into the applicant pool to get talented athletes” and was denying admissions slots to more-qualified applicants (Suggs, 2000). At Boston University, a myriad of the aforementioned factors led to the decision to drop football. The school severed their program in 1998, citing a \$3-million deficit as well as lack of interest and declining attendance (Haworth, 1997).

This review of literature has outlined the many considerations facing athletic administrators in the decision to add or drop a football program. There is very little existing research focusing solely on the reasons why administrations make such a decision. The existing literature acknowledges that more programs are being added or dropped, but does not offer a specific, in-depth analysis of the impetus behind the moves. The purpose of this study is to examine the primary reasons why administrators have decided to add or drop football, and in addition, investigate the opinions and outcomes behind the decisions.

Chapter III

Methodology

This chapter will describe the subjects involved in the survey of institutions that added or discontinued NCAA intercollegiate football programs between 1996 and 2005. It will also detail the process by which the survey was developed, as well as a general description of the survey itself. Finally, it will explain the statistical methods used to analyze the survey data.

Subjects

Thirty three NCAA member institutions added football programs from 1996 to 2005, and 17 institutions discontinued their football programs over the same time period (NCAA, 2005). This study seeks to survey the athletic department decision-makers at each of those institutions and determine the primary factors for either adding or dropping the sport of football. The institutions span all levels of the NCAA, including schools from revenue-producing Division I and non-scholarship Division III. All levels of the NCAA were included in this study in order to have a sufficient sample size and to accurately gauge the effects. With the aid of sport administration faculty and senior administrators in a Division I-A athletics department, the decision-makers were identified as the athletics director at the time of the decision, as well as all senior staff members (i.e. associate athletic director, assistant athletic director, senior woman administrator, etc.). Due to the length of time examined (1996-2005), it was expected many of these administrators may have changed jobs, retired, etc., since the decision was made to add or drop football. Respondents were asked to confirm if they were in their position at the time of the

decision, and if not, to provide any or all contact information for the person who was in that position at the time of the decision.

Instrumentation/Procedures

This study focused on the fifty NCAA members that added or dropped football programs from 1996 to 2005. These colleges and universities were identified through lists available from the NCAA football records book (NCAA, 2005). Only those schools identified as full-fledged NCAA members were included in the study. The survey will collect information from administrators by means of an online survey instrument. The survey was developed by the initial investigator, sport administration faculty and graduate students and senior administrators in a Division I-A athletics department. The survey questions seek to determine the different reasons a school may have added or dropped a football program. Once the list of reasons was compiled, two separate surveys were generated: one for those schools that added football, and one for those schools that dropped football. Survey questions were developed with a Likert-type scale, and respondents were asked to determine how much of a factor certain considerations were behind their decision to add or drop football, as well as their general satisfaction levels with their respective decisions. Lastly, provisions were made to ensure the survey complied with IRB regulations at the University of North Carolina.

Various procedures will be conducted to test the reliability and validity of the survey instrument. A pilot study will be sent to senior associate athletics administrators at a Division I-A athletics department as well as athletic directors and senior staff members at schools that have decided to add or drop football after 2005. Respondents in the pilot study will be asked to answer the survey questions as if they were an actual subject, and then critique the overall survey. The purpose of the pilot study is to provide feedback on the survey items and determine

if the survey will help accomplish the purpose of the overall study. Reliability will be determined by utilizing a Chronbach's Alpha analysis, and validity will be determined by utilizing face validity, which "is assessed by cursory review of the items (questions) by untrained individuals" (Statistics, 2007, p.1). Respondents from both the pilot study and actual study will be given the opportunity to see the results. Once the actual study is completed, the information will be organized into a database for statistical analysis using the SPSS software.

Data Analysis

Data from this study will be analyzed using descriptive statistics and frequencies. Tables depicting frequency and percentage will be used to summarize the responses. For example, 80% of respondents acknowledged that the desire to reduce total athletic department expenses was a major or somewhat important factor in their decision to drop football. It was assumed the population would not be obtained in this study.

Chapter IV

Results

This chapter will examine the research questions asked in Chapter I. Thirty total athletics administrators responded to the survey of NCAA member athletics programs that added football during the ten-year period of 1996 to 2005. There was at least one participant from half (15) of the schools in the sample. A total of five respondents were from a single institution, Florida Atlantic University, and there were three responses each from three other schools (Jacksonville University, La Salle University and Wisconsin Lutheran College). The breakdown in respondents by school is outlined below in Table 1:

Table 1

Number of Respondents by Institution – NCAA Member Athletics Programs that Added Football from 1996 to 2005

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Bryant	2	6.7
	Coastal	2	6.7
	Florida Atlantic	5	16.7
	Greensboro	2	6.7
	Jacksonville	3	10.0
	La Salle	3	10.0
	Mary Hardin-Baylor	1	3.3
	Merrimack	1	3.3
	Mount Ida	1	3.3
	Rockford	1	3.3
	Shenandoah	1	3.3
	South Florida	2	6.7
	SE Louisiana	2	6.7
	Westminster (MO)	1	3.3
	Wisconsin Lutheran	3	10.0
	Total	30	100.0

Of the 30 total respondents, 14 were employed by the athletic department at the time the decision was made to add a football program. Furthermore, 12 of those 14 were employed in their current position at the time of the decision. It should be noted that the survey contained a provision whereby respondents could opt out if they were not employed in their current position when the decision was made to add football. Thus, there were a high percentage of non-responses for each of the remaining questions asked on the survey. However, two of the five respondents from Florida Atlantic University opted out of the survey, so the data does not reflect a majority of responses from any one particular institution.

For those NCAA member schools that added a football program from 1996 to 2005, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Did schools add football in order to increase athletic department revenue?

Less than twenty percent of respondents (16.7%) believed increasing athletic department revenue was an important factor behind the decision to add football at their respective schools. Exactly one-third of all respondents (33.3%) stated the desire to bolster athletic department coffers was either a minor factor on the decision to add football, or not even discussed at all. The responses to this survey question are shown in Table 2:

Table 2

In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing athletic department revenue on the decision to add football?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	6.7
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	10	33.3
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	5	16.7
	No Response	13	43.3
	Total	30	100.0

2. Did schools add football in order to increase prestige?

A much higher percentage of athletic administrators believed the desire to increase institutional prestige played an important role in the decision to add football. Over one-third of all respondents (36.7%) believed the need to bolster the prestige of their school was a somewhat important or major factor on their decision. The results for this survey question are illustrated in Table 3:

Table 3

In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing the prestige of the institution on the decision to add football?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	6.7
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	5	16.7
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	11	36.7
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

3. Did schools add football in order to increase enrollment?

Of all questions on the survey, the largest percentage of administrators viewed the desire to increase enrollment as more important than any other single factor behind the decision to add football. Among respondents, 43.3% believed increasing enrollment at their respective schools was a somewhat important or major factor on their decision. The results for this survey question are depicted in Table 4:

Table 4

In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing enrollment on the decision to add football?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	3.3
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	5	16.7
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	13	43.3
	No Response	11	36.7
	Total	30	100.0

The responses to this survey question are further broken down by NCAA classification in Table 5. Of the five respondents who viewed increasing enrollment as a non-factor or minor factor behind their decision, four were from institutions adding football at the scholarship level. Meanwhile, among the 13 respondents who believed increasing enrollment was an important factor behind the decision, seven were from institutions adding football at the non-scholarship level.

Table 5

Responses to Enrollment Question Broken Down by NCAA Classification

		Classification				Total
		I-A	I-AA	II	III	I-A
Increase Enrollment	Do Not Know	0	0	1	0	1
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	4	0	0	1	5
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	1	5	2	5	13
	No Response	2	5	0	4	11
Total		7	10	3	10	30

4. Did schools add football in order to increase freshman applications?

Compared to the enrollment question, a lesser percentage of athletic administrators (36.7%) confirmed the desire to increase freshman applications was a somewhat important or major factor behind their decision to add football. The results for this survey question are shown in Table 6:

Table 6

In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing freshman applications on the decision to add football?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	6.7
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	5	16.7
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	11	36.7
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

5. Did schools add football in order to increase the athletic donor base?

The desire to increase the athletic donor base was viewed by fewer respondents as an important factor behind the decision to add football than the desire to increase enrollment or freshman applications. Exactly 26.7% of respondents viewed increasing the athletic donor base as a somewhat important or major factor in the decision process. The exact same percentage of respondents viewed increasing the athletic donor base as a minor factor or not even discussed at all. The results for this survey question are depicted in Table 7:

Table 7

In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing the athletic donor base on the decision to add football?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	6.7
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	8	26.7
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	8	26.7
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

6. Did schools add football in order to establish or maintain conference affiliation?

Of all questions on the survey, the desire to establish or maintain conference affiliation was viewed by the greatest percentage of administrators as a non-factor on the decision to add football. Exactly 43.3% of respondents regarded conference affiliation as either a minor factor or not discussed at all with respect to adding a football program. The results for this survey question are shown in Table 8:

Table 8

In your opinion, how much of a factor was establishing or maintaining conference affiliation on the decision to add football?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	3.3
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	13	43.3
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	4	13.3
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

7. Did schools add football because of any additional factors?

The desire to increase student-athlete opportunities also ranked among the most important factors behind the decision to add football. Exactly 36.7% of respondents believed it was a major or somewhat important factor behind their decision, which equaled the percentage

for the desire to increase freshman applications and the desire to increase prestige. The results to this survey question are depicted in Table 9:

Table 9

In your opinion, how much of a factor was increasing student-athlete opportunities on the decision to add football?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	6.7
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	6	20.0
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	11	36.7
	No Response	11	36.7
	Total	30	100.0

Among survey respondents, the desire to increase enrollment was viewed as the single most important factor behind the decision to add football. Several administrators expounded on the idea of increasing enrollment and student-athlete opportunities at their respective schools. They cited, among other things, the need to balance out the male-female ratio on campus and satisfy the “large supply of prospective young men wishing to experience college football.” In turn, the belief was a more balanced enrollment profile and the addition of football would help create a more diversified campus. As expected, other administrators cited institution-specific reasons for bringing football to their campus. One administrator at a Florida institution remarked college football “is the only way to solidify [credibility] in Florida”.

8. What are the opinions and outcomes of the decision to add football?

Among respondents to the survey of NCAA member athletics programs that added football programs from 1996 to 2005, sixteen out of eighteen agreed or strongly agreed the athletics director at their institution was satisfied with the decision. These results are illustrated in Table 10. Furthermore, Tables 10 and 11 demonstrate that only one respondent believed there

was dissatisfaction among the athletics department senior staff with the decision, and not a single respondent felt the athletics director was dissatisfied with the decision.

Table 10

The current director of athletics is satisfied with the decision to add football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	6.7
	Agree/Strongly Agree	16	53.3
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

Table 11

The current athletic department senior staff is satisfied with the decision to add football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	6.7
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	1	3.3
	Agree/Strongly Agree	15	50.0
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

Among respondents, there was limited disagreement that factors such as institutional prestige, enrollment, freshman applications, student-athlete opportunities and alumni donations to athletics had all increased at their respective schools since the decision to add football. A single respondent disagreed with each of the statements that prestige, enrollment and applications had increased, and zero respondents disagreed that student-athlete opportunities had increased since the decision. Two respondents did not believe alumni donations to athletics had increased since the addition of football. These responses are shown in Tables 12-16:

Table 12

The prestige of the university has increased since the institution added football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	3	10.0
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	1	3.3
	Agree/Strongly Agree	14	46.7
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

Table 13

Enrollment has increased since the institution added football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	3.3
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	1	3.3
	Agree/Strongly Agree	14	46.7
	No Response	14	46.7
	Total	30	100.0

Table 14

Freshman applications have increased since the institution added football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	4	13.3
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	1	3.3
	Agree/Strongly Agree	13	43.3
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

Table 15

Student-athlete opportunities have increased since the institution added football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	3.3
	Agree/Strongly Agree	17	56.7
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

Table 16

Alumni donations to athletics have increased since the institution added football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	3.3
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	2	6.7
	Agree/Strongly Agree	14	46.7
	No Response	13	43.3
	Total	30	100.0

However, there was more disagreement among athletics administrators that athletics department revenues, and in particular football revenues, have exceeded expenses at their respective institutions since the decision was made to add football. The responses to these questions are illustrated in Tables 17-18:

Table 17

Athletics department revenues exceeded expenses in the first year after the institution added football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	3	10.0
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	9	30.0
	Agree/Strongly Agree	6	20.0
	No Response	12	40.0
	Total	30	100.0

Table 18

FOOTBALL revenues have exceeded expenses in at least one year since the institution added football

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	6.7
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	9	30.0
	Agree/Strongly Agree	5	16.7
	No Response	14	46.7
	Total	30	100.0

One administrator at a Division I-AA institution acknowledged “the mere operation of football” led to a budget deficit at their particular school. However, one athletics director at a Division III institution reaffirmed the idea that football more than pays for itself at this level. Although the football program did not generate revenue in the form of sponsorship partners or ticket sales, the administrator acknowledged it did bring in numerous tuition-paying male students. Since no athletics scholarships are awarded at Division III schools, revenue for the school is generated simply by “students who otherwise would not be attending...if it were not for the participation opportunity.” The substantial cost of athletics scholarships led some schools that are Division I members in all other sports to add football at the non-scholarship level. An administrator at one of these institutions confirmed football was “a cash cow” of a different kind with over 100 student-athletes on the roster paying tuition and fees to the school.

Twenty-four total athletics administrators responded to the survey of NCAA member athletics programs that dropped football between 1996 and 2005. There was at least one participant from 12 out of the 17 schools in the sample. A total of four respondents were from a single institution, Canisius College, and there were three responses each from California State University, Northridge, and East Tennessee State University. The breakdown in respondents by school is outlined below in Table 19:

Table 19

Number of Respondents by Institution – NCAA Member Athletics Programs that Dropped Football from 1996 to 2005

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Cal State Chico	2	8.3
	Cal State Northridge	3	12.5
	Canisius	4	16.7
	East Tennessee State	3	12.5
	Evansville	2	8.3
	UMASS Lowell	2	8.3
	Pacific	1	4.2
	St. John's	1	4.2
	St. Mary's (CA)	1	4.2
	Siena	2	8.3
	Sonoma State	2	8.3
	Swarthmore	1	4.2
	Total	24	100.0

Of the 24 total respondents, exactly half were employed by the athletics department at the time the decision was made to add a football program. However, only eight of those 24 were employed in their current position at the time of the decision. As with the other survey, there were a high percentage of non-responses to each question since survey participants could opt out if they were not employed in their current position at the time of the decision. However, there were far fewer non-responses on the survey of schools that dropped football, and one of the respondents from Canisius opted out of the survey, the data does not reflect a majority of responses from any one particular institution.

For those NCAA member schools that dropped a football program from 1996 to 2005, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Did schools drop football in order to reduce total athletic department expenses?

Exactly two-thirds of the athletics administrators who responded to this survey felt the need to save money was a somewhat important or major factor behind their respective decisions

to drop football. Only one respondent believed the desire to cut costs was a minor factor or not even discussed at all. The responses to this question are shown in Table 20:

Table 20

In your opinion, how much of a factor was reducing total athletic department expenses on the decision to drop football?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	4.2	4.2
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	1	4.2	4.2
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	16	66.7	66.7
	No Response	6	25.0	25.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

2. Did schools drop football because of Title IX?

Exactly 45.8% of respondents believed Title IX also played an important factor on the decision to drop football. This factor was not deemed important by as many athletics administrators as the desire to reduce expenses, but the federal gender equity law was still seen as an important part of the decision-making process. Table 21 illustrates the results to this survey question.

Table 21

In your opinion, how much of a factor was Title IX on the decision to drop football?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	4.2	4.2
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	6	25.0	25.0
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	11	45.8	45.8
	No Response	6	25.0	25.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

3. Did schools drop football because of a lack of a winning program?

The lack of a winning football program was deemed by respondents as equally important and non-important on the decision to drop the sport. Nine athletics administrators believed the lack of success was a somewhat important or major factor behind the decision, while the same number felt it was a minor factor or not even discussed at all. The results for this survey question are represented in Table 22:

Table 22

In your opinion, how much of a factor was the lack of a winning program on the decision to drop football?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	9	37.5	37.5
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	9	37.5	37.5
	No Response	6	25.0	25.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

4. Did schools drop football because of football game attendance?

Only seven out of 24 respondents (29.2%) believed football game attendance was a somewhat important or major factor behind the decision to drop football. A higher percentage of athletics administrators (41.7%) felt football game attendance was not part of the decision-making process. The results for this survey question are shown in Table 23:

Table 23

In your opinion, how much of a factor was football game attendance on the decision to drop football?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	4.2	4.2
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	10	41.7	41.7
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	7	29.2	29.2
	No Response	6	25.0	25.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

5. Did schools drop football in order to establish or maintain conference affiliation?

Exactly half of all respondents felt the desire to establish or maintain conference affiliation was a non-factor on the decision to drop football. This is not a surprising finding since most institutions would presumably add football rather than drop the sport in order to gain conference membership. The results for this survey question are depicted in Table 24:

Table 24

In your opinion, how much of a factor was the desire to establish or maintain conference affiliation on the decision to drop football?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	4.2	4.2
	Not a Factor/Not Discussed/Minor Factor	12	50.0	50.0
	Somewhat Important Factor/Major Factor	5	20.8	20.8
	No Response	6	25.0	25.0
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

6. Did schools drop football because of any additional factors?

Administrators at four separate California institutions cited the lack of reasonable competition available on the West Coast. For those schools, it was “impossible to create a schedule with only two teams.” Others pointed to a reduction in financial support from their respective state governments. In fact, one administrator cited a lack of support from multiple sources: the state legislature, students and alumni. And lastly, one athletics director noted their school dropped football due to the “off campus behavior of team members.”

7. What are the opinions and outcomes of the decision to drop football?

Compared to the survey of NCAA member athletics programs that added football programs from 1996 to 2005, there was slightly less uniform agreement among administrators at institutions that dropped the sport during the same time period. However, Tables 25-27 do show

that the majority of respondents believed the current athletics director, athletics department senior staff and board of trustees were satisfied with the decision to drop football. Not a single respondent believed the current board of trustees was unhappy with the decision.

Table 25

The current director of athletics is satisfied with the decision to drop football

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	3	12.5	12.5
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	2	8.3	8.3
	Agree/Strongly Agree	11	45.8	45.8
	No Response	8	33.3	33.3
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

Table 26

The current athletic department senior staff is satisfied with the decision to drop football

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	1	4.2	4.2
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	4	16.7	16.7
	Agree/Strongly Agree	12	50.0	50.0
	No Response	7	29.2	29.2
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

Table 27

The current board of trustees is satisfied with the decision to drop football

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	4	16.7	16.7
	Agree/Strongly Agree	13	54.2	54.2
	No Response	7	29.2	29.2
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

Exactly 45.8% of respondents believed the elimination of football led to a balanced budget within their respective athletics departments. Table 28 illustrates these findings. An even higher percentage of respondents (54.2%) felt that their athletics department had been in compliance with Title IX since the decision. Those responses are shown in Table 29:

Table 28

The athletic department has operated with a balanced budget since the institution dropped football

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	6	25.0	25.0
	Agree/Strongly Agree	11	45.8	45.8
	No Response	7	29.2	29.2
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

Table 29

The athletic department has been in compliance with Title IX since the decision to drop football

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	4	16.7	16.7
	Agree/Strongly Agree	13	54.2	54.2
	No Response	7	29.2	29.2
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

On the whole, athletics administrators refuted any notions of their respective institutions suffering from the decision to drop football. Exactly 62.5% of respondents felt student enrollment numbers and the number of freshman applications had not decreased since the decision. And over half of the respondents (54.2%) believed alumni donations to athletics had not declined as well. One particular administrator even remarked how at their institution the elimination of football had made the other athletics programs more competitive due to “budget reallocations.” These numbers are reflected in Tables 30-32:

Table 30

Student enrollment numbers have decreased since the institution dropped football

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	15	62.5	62.5
	Agree/Strongly Agree	2	8.3	8.3
	No Response	7	29.2	29.2
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

Table 31

The number of freshman applications to the institution has decreased since the institution dropped football

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	15	62.5	62.5
	Agree/Strongly Agree	2	8.3	8.3
	No Response	7	29.2	29.2
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

Table 32

Alumni donations to athletics have decreased since the institution dropped football

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Do Not Know	2	8.3	8.3
	Strongly Disagree/Disagree	13	54.2	54.2
	Agree/Strongly Agree	2	8.3	8.3
	No Response	7	29.2	29.2
	Total	24	100.0	100.0

Chapter V

Discussion

Institutions consider many factors when deciding to add or drop football. In a survey of NCAA member athletics programs that added football between 1996 and 2005, athletics administrators cited the desire to increase enrollment as a factor behind the decision more than any other single factor. The next most important factors were the desire to increase freshman applications, enhance institutional prestige and create more opportunities for student-athletes. Meanwhile, a much smaller percentage of respondents believed the desire to increase athletic department revenue or increase the athletic donor base were important factors behind the decision to add football. These findings are consistent with recent literature suggesting that more schools now view football as a means to boost their overall institutional profile through increased enrollment rather than a vehicle to realize tangible increases in athletic department revenue. Indeed, more than half of the respondents who believed increasing enrollment was an important factor behind the decision to add football were from institutions adding the sport at the non-scholarship level.

These findings also suggest that athletic administrators pondering the football question were aware of the lack of any conclusive empirical data supporting a positive relationship between a winning football team and alumni donations to athletics. The addition of football as a sport may not be able to turn a profit for the athletic department, but it can provide revenue for the school as a whole by increasing the number of tuition-paying male students. Athletic administrators were fairly united in responding that their institutions had seen increased

enrollment, as well as increased application numbers, prestige and opportunities available to student-athletes, since the decision was made to add football.

For those schools that dropped football from 1996 to 2005, the desire to reduce total athletic department expenses was viewed by more athletics administrators as an important factor behind their decisions than any other single factor. The next most important factor was Title IX considerations. An even smaller percentage of respondents believed the lack of a winning program was an important factor behind the decision to drop football. These findings are reflective of recent NCAA reports chronicling the rising costs of fielding and maintaining an intercollegiate football program. Schools view the elimination of football as a means to retain some financial flexibility in administering their programs. In addition, dropping football helps schools achieve compliance with Title IX, as they no longer have to deal with the large size of a football team roster. Surprisingly, athletic administrators did not report any negative institutional effects from the decision to eliminate the sport. Respondents to this survey were fairly united in confirming their schools had not experienced reductions in the number of enrollees, applications or donations to athletics.

In the current landscape of intercollegiate athletics, administrators seem more aware than ever their athletic departments are more likely to lose money than make it. Some schools responded to this reality by dropping the most expensive sport altogether in order to reduce expenditures. Other institutions chose not to view football as a financial burden and instead focused on the positive aspects the sport might bring to their respective campuses. When pondering the football question, athletic departments were less likely to get caught with dollar signs in their eyes and hopes of securing television deals or a piece of the Bowl Championship

Series pie. Rather, they were more likely to focus on how the sport could positively impact their respective institutions.

An initial recommendation for future research is to expand this study to include schools that have added or dropped football programs since 2005. This expansion would be useful to see if the same trends as to why schools added or dropped football between 1996 and 2005 still exist today. A major flaw with the study was athletic administrators could opt out from the survey if they were not employed in their current position at the time of the decision. This option led to a high percentage of non-responses for each question. Although respondents might not have known all of the factors at play behind the decision to add or drop football, they likely still could have provided valuable opinions on how the decision has impacted their respective institutions. Nonetheless, this study is an important indicator of how numerous institutions and intercollegiate athletic departments view the football question.

Appendix A: Survey of Schools that Added Football from 1996 to 2005

1. Please select your institution:

- ☐ Averett University
- ☐ Becker College
- ☐ Bryant University
- ☐ University of Charleston (West Virginia)
- ☐ Christopher Newport University
- ☐ Coastal Carolina University
- ☐ East Texas Baptist University
- ☐ Florida Atlantic University
- ☐ Florida International University
- ☐ Greensboro College
- ☐ Hartwick College
- ☐ Jacksonville University
- ☐ La Salle University
- ☐ Louisiana College
- ☐ University of Mary Hardin-Baylor
- ☐ Merrimack College
- ☐ University of Minnesota, Crookston
- ☐ Mount Ida College
- ☐ North Greenville University
- ☐ Rockford College
- ☐ Saint Anselm College
- ☐ St. Augustine's College
- ☐ St. Paul's College
- ☐ Shaw University
- ☐ Shenandoah University
- ☐ University of South Florida
- ☐ Southeastern Louisiana University
- ☐ Stillman College
- ☐ Swarthmore College
- ☐ Texas Lutheran University
- ☐ Utica College
- ☐ Westminster College (Missouri)
- ☐ Wisconsin Lutheran College

2. Were you employed by the athletic department (employee, intern, volunteer, etc.) when the decision was made to add the football program?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

3. Were you employed in your current position with the athletic department when the decision was made to add the football program?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

(if they select "No" to question #2 or #3, they will go to question #4)

4. If possible, please list any or all of the contact information you may have for the person who was in your position at the time the decision was made (this information will only be used for research, approved by the IRB board at UNC-Chapel Hill):

Name:

Current employer/position:

E-mail address:

(survey ends here for those who selected “No” to question #2)

5. My current job title is (please select all that apply):

- ☐ Director of Athletics
- ☐ Associate Athletic Director
- ☐ Assistant Athletic Director
- ☐ Senior Woman Administrator
- ☐ Other

6. Please select the job title you held at the time the decision was made to add football (please select all that apply):

- ☐ Director of Athletics
- ☐ Associate Athletic Director
- ☐ Assistant Athletic Director
- ☐ Senior Woman Administrator
- ☐ Other

Please select your response based on the following reasons why your institution added football. Please answer all questions **in your opinion only** and to best of your ability.

7. Prior to adding football as a sport, in your opinion, how much of a factor was the following on the decision to add football?

	Do Not Know	Not a Factor/Not Discussed	Minor Factor	Somewhat Important Factor	Major Factor
Increase athletic department revenue	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase the prestige of the institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase enrollment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase freshman applications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase student-athlete opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase the athletic donor base	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Establish or maintain conference affiliation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Please list any other factors that may have played a part in the decision to add football at the institution:

Please select your response under each statement that best represents your opinion on the effect of adding football at your institution. Please answer all questions **in your opinion only** and to best of your ability

9. The current director of athletics is satisfied with the decision to add football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

10. The current athletic department senior staff is satisfied with the decision to add football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

11. Athletic department revenues exceeded expenses in the first year after the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

12. **Football** revenues have exceeded expenses in at least one year since the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

13. The prestige of the university has increased since the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

14. Enrollment has increased since the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

15. Freshman applications have increased since the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

16. Student-athlete opportunities have increased since the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

17. Alumni donations to athletics have increased since the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

18. Alumni donations to the university general fund have increased since the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

19. Corporate sponsorship revenue has increased since the institution added football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

20. Sales of licensed merchandise/gear have increased since the institution added football.
Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

21. If you would like to add anything further, please take the time to complete.

22. If you would like the results of the study upon its completion, please list your contact information below. Thank you once again for taking the time to complete the survey.

Appendix B: Survey of Schools that Dropped Football from 1996 to 2005

1. Please select your institution:

- ☐ Boston University
- ☐ California State University, Chico
- ☐ California State University, Northridge
- ☐ Canisius College
- ☐ East Tennessee State University
- ☐ University of Evansville
- ☐ Fairfield University
- ☐ University of Massachusetts, Boston
- ☐ University of Massachusetts at Lowell
- ☐ University of New Haven
- ☐ New Jersey City University
- ☐ University of the Pacific
- ☐ St. John's University (New York)
- ☐ St. Mary's College of California
- ☐ Siena College
- ☐ Sonoma State University
- ☐ Swarthmore College

2. Were you employed (employee, intern, volunteer, etc.) by the athletic department when the decision was made to drop the football program?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

3. Were you employed in your current position with the athletic department when the decision was made to drop the football program?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

(if they select "No" to question #3, they will go to question #4)

4. If possible, please list any or all of the contact information you may have for the person who was in your position at the time the decision was made (this information will only be used for research, approved by the IRB board at UNC-Chapel Hill):

Name:

Current Employer/Position:

E-mail address:

(survey ends here for those who selected "No" to question #2)

5. My current job title is (please select all that apply):

- ☐ Director of Athletics
- ☐ Associate Athletic Director
- ☐ Assistant Athletic Director
- ☐ Senior Woman Administrator
- ☐ Other

6. Please select the job title you held at the time the decision was made to drop football (please select all that apply):

- ☐ Director of Athletics
- ☐ Associate Athletic Director
- ☐ Assistant Athletic Director
- ☐ Senior Woman Administrator
- ☐ Other (please list)

Please select your response based on the following reasons why your institution dropped football. Please answer all questions **in your opinion only** and to best of your ability.

7. Prior to dropping football as a sport, in your opinion, how much of a factor was the following on the decision to drop football?

	Do Not Know	Not a Factor/Not Discussed	Minor Factor	Somewhat Important Factor	Major Factor
Reduce total athletic department expenses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Title IX considerations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of a winning program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Football game attendance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Establish or maintain conference affiliation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Please list any other factors that may have played a part in the decision to drop football at the institution:

Please select your response under each statement that best represents your opinion on the effect of dropping football at your institution. Please answer all questions **in your opinion only** and to best of your ability.

9. The current director of athletics is satisfied with the decision to drop football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

10. The current athletic department senior staff is satisfied with the decision to drop football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

11. The current board of trustees is satisfied with the decision to drop football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

12. The athletic department has operated with a balanced budget since the institution dropped football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

13. The athletic department has been in compliance with Title IX since the decision to drop football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

14. Student enrollment numbers have decreased since the institution dropped football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

15. The number of freshman applications to the institution has decreased since the institution dropped football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

16. Alumni donations to athletics have decreased since the institution dropped football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

17. Alumni donations to the university general fund have decreased since the institution dropped football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

18. Sales of licensed merchandise/gear have decreased since the institution dropped football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

19. Corporate sponsorship revenues have decreased since the institution dropped football.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

20. The athletic department is satisfied with its present conference affiliation.

Do Not Know Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

21. If you would like to add anything further, please take the time to complete.

22. If you would like the results of the study upon its completion, please list your contact information below. Thank you once again for taking the time to complete the survey.

REFERENCES

- Associated Press (2006a, February 19). University drops football program. *The Ledger*. Retrieved on February 22, 2006, from <http://www.theledger.com>
- Associated Press (2006b, June 1). *Game on: Old Dominion to add football for 2009*. Retrieved on September 19, 2006, from the Rivals.com College Football Web site: <http://collegefootball.rivals.com/content.asp?CID=549061>
- Bennett, R. and Fize, J. (1995). Telecast deregulation and competitive balance: Regarding NCAA Division I football. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 54(2): 183-199.
- Bowl Championship Series:: BCS Background (n.d.). Retrieved October, 22, 2006, from <http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfb/about>
- Bowl Championship Series:: FAQ (n.d.). Retrieved January 16, 2007, from <http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfb/faq>
- Bowl Championship Series:: TV Ratings (n.d.). Retrieved January 16, 2007, from <http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfb/tvratings>
- Burris, J. (2004, September 8). Athletics not worth the price. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved on September 9, 2004, from <http://www.boston.com>
- Campbell, R.M. (1998, December 17). *NCAA college football attendance surpasses 37-million for first time in history*. Retrieved on October 22, 2006, from <http://www.ncaa.org/releases/attendance/1998121701at.htm>
- Carey, J. & O'Toole, T. (2006, August 16). A dozen I-A programs facing trouble without better attendance. *USA Today*. Retrieved on August 17, 2006, from <http://www.usatoday.com>
- Coe, R.M. (2005, November 8). UNC-P hopes football will unite community. *The Daily Tar Heel*. Retrieved on September 27, 2006, from <http://www.dailytarheel.com>
- College will be glad it has football (2006, August 9). *Hendersonville Times-News*. Retrieved on September 20, 2006, from <http://www.hendersonvillenews.com>
- Cowen, S. (2003, October 29). BCS or bust: Competitive and economic effects of the bowl championship series on and off the field. Retrieved on February 4, 2007, from <http://coalition.tulane.edu/testimony3.shtml>
- Elmore, C. (2006, November 7). FAU stadium: If they will build it, who will come? *Palm Beach Post*. Retrieved on November 7, 2006 from <http://www.palmbeachpost.com>

- Frank, R.H. (2004, May). *Challenging the myth: A review of the links among college athletic success, student quality, and donations*. Ithaca, NY: Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.
- Fulks, D.L. (2003). *Revenues and Expenses, Profits and Losses of Division I-A Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Aggregated by Conference – 2003 Fiscal Year*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Fulks, D.L. (2004, April 12). Arms race debate open to interpretation. *The NCAA News*. Retrieved on September 21, 2006, from <http://www.ncaa.org>
- Fulks, D.L. (2005a). *2002-03 Revenues and Expenses of Divisions I and II Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Report*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Fulks, D.L. (2005b). *2002-03 Revenues and Expenses of Division III Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Report*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Harris, H. (2006, July 7). ETSU would benefit from football's return. *The Daily Times*. Retrieved on July 6, 2006, from <http://www.thedailytimes.com>
- Haworth, K. (1997). Boston U. to drop its football program at season's end. [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 44(12), A48.
- Let Them Play Foundation. (2005). *The case for Santa Clara football added & discontinued programs*. Santa Clara, CA: Author.
- NCAA. (2005). *Division I football records*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- NCAA. (2006). *2006-07 NCAA Division I manual*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- NCAA History of the NCAA (n.d.). Retrieved January 3, 2007, from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/history.html>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association v. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma*, United States Supreme Court, 468 U.S. 85, 1984.
- Noll, R.G. (1999). The business of college sports and the high cost of winning. *Milliken Institute Review*, (Fall), 24-37.
- Orszag, J.M. & Orszag, P.R. (2005). *The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An update*. Commissioned by the NCAA. Retrieved on January 23, 2007, from <http://www.ncaa.org>

- Pennington, B. (2006a, July 10). Small colleges, short of men, embrace football. *New York Times*. Retrieved on July 11, 2006, from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Pennington, B. (2006b, October 7). At James Madison, Title IX is satisfied, but the students are not. *New York Times*. Retrieved on January 2, 2007, from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Perrin, T. (1987). *Football: A college history*. Jefferson, North Carolina, and London: McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Scott, D. & Olson, S. (2005, December 22). 49ers still punting on football. *The Charlotte Observer*. Retrieved on December 28, 2005, from <http://www.charlotte.com>
- Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Statistics:: Face Validity (n.d.). Retrieved February 20, 2007 from <http://www.statistics.com/resources/glossary/f/facevalid.php>
- Suggs, W. (n.d.). *Making the varsity: College sports and institutional choices*. Retrieved on September 14, 2004, from <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ffp0514s.pdf>
- Suggs, W. (2000). Swarthmore kicks football out of the college. [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(16), A55.
- Suggs, W. (2003a). Budget problems and title IX spur sports cutbacks at 3 colleges [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(18), A33.
- Suggs, W. (2003b). More small universities are getting rid of football [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(24), A33.
- Suggs, W. (2003c). Sports as the university's 'front porch'? The public is skeptical [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(34), A17.
- Suggs, W. (2004). Football, television and the Supreme Court. [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(44), A32.
- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 (2000).
- Toma, J.D. and Cross, M.E. (1998). Intercollegiate athletics and student college choice: Exploring the impact of championship seasons on undergraduate applications. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 633-661.
- Toma, J.D. (2003). *Football U.: Spectator sports in the life of the American university*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Turner, S.E., Meserve, L.A. & Bowen, W.G. (2001). Winning and giving: Football results and alumni giving at select private colleges and Universities. *Social Science Quarterly*, 15, 812.

Weiberg, S. (2005, December 7). Bowls give Big Ten conference a big payday. *USA Today*. Retrieved on October 23, 2006 from <http://www.usatoday.com>